DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 174 FL 016 482

AUTHOR Wikberg, Kay
TITLE Some Critical Observations on Present-Day English Lexicology.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 15p.; In: Ringbom, Hakan, Ed,; Rissanen, Matti, Ed. Proceedings from the Nordic Conference for English Studies (2nd, Hanasaari/Hanaholmen, Finland, May 19-21, 1983); see FL 016 498.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Data Collection; Definitions; Diachronic Linguistics; Dialect Studies; *English; *Intellectual Disciplines; Language Research; Language Styles; *Lexicology; *Linguistic Theory; Morphemes; Morphology (Languages); Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS *Word Formation

ABSTRACT

Some aspects of the field of lexicology in general, and of English lexicology in particular, are examined in light of current linguistic theory. Definitions of lexicology, its role in linguistics, the concept and nature of lexical competence, the relationship of grammar and lexicon, and the process of lexicalization are reviewed. Conversion and compounding are looked at as examples of word-formation processes, and the quality of the corpora of lexical research is discussed. The analysis concludes that in English studies, lexicology has touched the areas of the history of vocabulary, dialect research, derivational morphology, word-formation lexicography, and stylistics, and while it cannot be viewed as an autonomous subdivision of linguistics, it is a legitimate field of study alongside grammar. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279174

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY N. Enkvist TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Kay Wikberg
School of Languages and Literature
University of Tromsø

SOME CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY*

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to examine critically some aspects of lexicology in general and English lexicology in particular in the light of current linguistic theory. The paper originates in a long-term concern with the growth and nature of the lexical competence of learners of English in Finland and Norway. This explains the references to TEFL word lists later on and the author's interest in the generative capacity of the basic vocabulary.

The beginning of the paper (2) deals briefly with the definition of 'lexicology' (2.1), the role of lexicology in linguistics (2.2-2.3), lexical competence (2.4) and lexical processes (2.5). Section (3) takes up conversion (3.1) and compounding (3.2) as examples of word-formation processes. Section (4), finally, adds some notes on corpora.

2 GENERAL REMARKS ON LEXICOLOGY

2.1 WHAT IS 'LEXICOLOGY'?

There is not full agreement on what 'lexicology' is about except that it somehow has as its object the description of the vocabulary or lexicon of a given language. The Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature includes three subheadings under "Vocabulary": (1) "Words and Idioms", (2) "Names", and (3) "Dictionaries and Lexicography". It is (1) that is the main concern of lexicology, the study of names being a more specialized field. Lexicography or the writing of dictionaries is in part an application of lexicology.

Quirk et al. (1972:8) confine the object of lexicology to "the study of words" and make semantics into something which "has relevance equally within lexicology and grammar." By "words" I assume they mean "lexical items". Crystal (1980), again, seems to identify lexicology with (lexical) semantics.

A reasonable definition of 'lexicology' would seem to be the following:

LEXICOLOGY IS THE STUDY OF THE LEXICON, i.e. THE SYNTAGMATIC, SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC PROPERTIES OF LEXICAL ITEMS, AND THE PROCESSES OF LEXICALIZATION AND WORD-FORMATION.

*The author is grateful to Cambridge University Press and Longman for permission to make a file of their vocabularies (CAMLIST and LONGLIST).

FL016482

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

According to this, then, the form and content of lexical items, lexicalization and word-formation are the major interests in lexicology. The syntagmatic properties include collocations, but as Halliday has pointed out many times, there is no clear borderline between grammar and lexis. "The lexicon ... is simply the most delicate grammar" (1978:43).

2.2 LEXICOLOGY IN LINGUISTIC THEORY

In the literature on TGG the term 'lexicology' is hardly found at all. The description of the lexicon is part of the grammar, in a sense the dead end of the grammatical analysis where all the idiosyncracies are stored, including the phonological properties. In TGG the morphological component is in charge of word structure, i.e. inflection and derivation. Although inflection cannot be excluded from lexicology altogether (cp. irregular forms like man-men, run-ran-run), I shall here assume that derivational morphology is more important since it accounts for the stable formal properties of lexical items in isolation (cp. girl, girl-ie, girl-ish). Phonology, too, has a share in lexicology, such as when assigning stress to compounds, but will not be discussed in this context.

There are several reasons for the low reputation that synchronic lexicology has had until fairly recently. One is the fact that mainstream linguistics has been sentence-based for 25 years or more. Admittedly there has been a certain spin-off from work on semantics in TGG and the description of word-formation has profited greatly from progress in syntactic theory. In Europe lexicology has always attracted more attention, and particularly in the Soviet Union lexicology has an established status.[1]

Another possible reason for the neglect of the lexicon is the great interest in larger units than the sentence, i.e. texts, which characterizes the work of many linguists today. This research has proved that it is necessary for the understanding of texts to account for much more than the information provided by the traditional lexicon and sentence semantics. One consequence of this is that those who believe in the semantic autonomy of lexical items have been even more frustrated than before.

Textlinguistic research has no doubt added to our knowledge of the lexicon. Lexical units as they appear in a list, alphabetical or not, are dead ready-made units, like blueberries in a pail. Strung together into sentences and texts lexical items bring into play their covert properties, which may have to do with contextual meaning, co-occurrence in the form of collocations, or semantic networks. In fiction, some types of journalism and in child language words often come alive in a conspicuous manner because they represent deviations from lexical usage or additions to the dictionary. This creativity contrasts with the

view of the lexicon as something linguists resort to to replace syntactic categories in a tree, or as a mere repository.

Weinreich's general programme for lexicological research drawn up in 1963 is still valid although one has to allow for the relevant changes in linguistic theory. Thus in lexical semantics there have been ups and downs in the popularity of semantic features. The present trend is down rather than up. Labov's investigations, for instance, show that even the demarcation of such everyday words as cup, bowl and vase in relation to specific concrete referents is by no means straightforward. The fuzziness of items like sort of, principally and literally is even more difficult to account for (Labov 1973a, 1973b). Rosch's prototype semantics should also be mentioned in this context (Rosch 1973).

When it comes to the choice of a theoretical model for lexicological research, the lexicologist will have to commit himself/herself to linguistic theory in a more general sense. For example, the study of lexical hierarchies makes different demands on the model than the study of word-formation. Hierarchies are closely linked up with the psychological process of categorization (superordinate - subordinate, part - whole relationships). Word-formation is more controversial, but offers scope for both transformationalists, lexicalists, and some happy medium between the two.

According to Beard (1981:12), "all of the empirical data upon which a lexical theory must be based are fundamentally psychological. The raw data of performance involve not only linguistic knowledge, but strategies of access, mnemonic restrictions, errors and the like, as well... Secondly, any adequate theory of lexical competence ultimately must be compatible with the data of performance."

2.3 LEXICAL COMPETENCE

Whatever the exact nature of lexical competence, it can never reach the same level of completeness as grammatical (syntactic) competence. For well known reasons the size of the vocabularies of individual speakers varies greatly. Memorization obviously plays a major role in lexical competence as compared with other aspects of grammatical competence. Even so there is one sense in which grammatical and lexical competence are similar: both are characterized by great creativity. An example: the transitive use of pedestrianize in the sense of 'turn into an area for pedestrians' is fairly recent. Once the native speaker and the advanced FL learner have understood that word, the noun pedestrianization is automatically understood, and so is its use in a compound like pedestrianization scheme (sign in a street in Lancaster). Although the base pedestrian may be the only form that a given speaker will ever use, lexical theory will have to accommodate the other forms as well.

Selkirk mentions two reasons why "the list of items called the dictionary forms part of the speaker's knowledge (or grammar) of a language" (1982:11). One is the speaker's intuitions about what is a(n) actual/possible word in a language, the other is the high degree of unpredictability of word properties. The former is based on familiarity with phonological, orthographic and morphological features, the latter is related to the independence of lexical units.

2.4 GRAMMAR AND THE LEXICON

As to the relation between grammar and the lexicon, it is risky to say anything definite at a time when this field is subject to intense research. If we take Fillmore's case grammar (1968), for instance, it is centred on the verb and its arguments, which means that in that model there will be overlap between the grammatical and the lexical analysis of the verb. Case grammar has turned out to be useful for the description of word-formation (cp. Ljung 1970, Warren 1978, Beard 1981, Kastovsky 1982) because it combines syntactic and semantic considerations at a suitable level of delicacy.

In recent studies within the framework of TGG the lexicon has been given more and more attention, and the share of the lexicon in the grammar as a whole has increased (cp. Bresnan 1978, Hoekstra et al. 1981). Although this new lexical grammar may in the end add to our understanding of the lexicon, it involves first of all a restructuring of the components of linguistic theory.

There is fairly general agreement on one fundamental difference between lexical units and sentences: lexical units can generally be listed (and stored) whereas phrases and sentences cannot. It is also recognized that there may be differences between lexical and syntactic rules. According to Wasow (1977), for instance, lexical rules may change category labels, as in

$[X]_N \rightarrow [[X]_N \text{ -ish}]_{Adj}$ e.g. $\text{girl}_N \rightarrow \text{girlish}_{Adj}$

and it is common for lexical rules to have idiosyncratic exceptions. But again, any such argument must be seen in the light of the relevant linguistic model.

2.5 LEXICAL PROCESSES

The process of 'lexicalization', which is included in the definition above, is important in this context. It refers to (a) the replacement of compositional features with lexical items (CAUSE BECOME NOT ALIVE = kill), also called 'lexical insertion', and (b) the insertion of a lexical item into the lexicon. The former relies on a particular linguistic theory (generative semantics) whereas the latter seems to have more universal application and psychological reality since it reflects what happens when a neologism is created (neologization), or when a speaker adds an already available item to his/her particular lexicon (memorization). It may also make the lexicographer add a new item to the dic-

tionary (codification).

The notion of 'process' is intimately linked with the lexicon. Semantic change and various types of word-formation are well known examples. The process of neologization differs from the production of a novel sentence, and thus from the application of syntactic rules by storing items in the lexicon. However, not all new lexical items need to be stored because of the access to productive rules and their application to already available bases and morphemes in performance (cp. the examples with bottle in (3.2)).

Beard (1981:29-32) distinguishes between two types of neologisms: (1) "base extension" and (2) "base stock expansion". Base extension refers to "what the lexicon can do" (27), i.e. the more or less predictable extension of the lexicon by means of its own bases, morphemes and rules. This includes derivation, compounding (cp. pedestrian in (2.3)) and conversion. Base stock expansion refers to "what can be done to the lexicon" (28) through language-external influences, such as borrowing, loan translation, acronyms, blending and back-formation. It consists of processes that are less predictable than base extension and which cause difficulty to any word-formation model based on rules.

This brief exposition cannot do justice to the complex phenomenon of lexicalization. However, in the following section we shall look more closely at two highly productive types of word-formation.

3 SOME WORD-FORMATION PROCESSES

After these theoretical preliminaries we shall examine the role of conversion and compounding particularly with regard to high-frequency content words in English. A file (here called COMPLIST) consisting of 3,457 different items was created on the basis of 5 other lists:

FINNLIST, recommended basic vocabulary for the Finnish comprehensive school;
NORLIST, recommended vocabulary for the Norwegian comprehensive school;
T-LIST, the vocabulary in The Threshold Level;
CAMLIST, vocabulary for TEFL teaching; and
LONGLIST, the defining vocabulary of LDOCE.[2]

The main intention with COMPLIST was to make a file which combined the principles of (a) word frequencies, (b) utility, and (c) metalinguistic requirements. In this context, however, we are not concerned with criteria for vocabulary selection, nor with the characteristics of any of these lists.

It is well known that the high-frequency content words in English tend to be monolexemic, and mainly of Germanic and French origin. Of the words in West's General Service List of English Words 51 % are Germanic and 38 % French by origin (Scheler 1977:84). The higher the rank, the more likely is the Germanic origin.

The flexibility of the high-frequency bases in English is probably best seen in polysemy and in the process of conversion, which applies to numerous words of low rank and more complex structure as well. In my COMPLIST 521 diferent forms are polyfunctional, i.e. they can function as two or more word classes (e.g. open the door (V), the door is open (Adj), life in the open (N)).

3.1 CONVERSION[3]

One type of conversion, that of denominal verbs, has attracted particular attention recently. Like compounding, conversion is an extremely productive process in English. Clark & Clark (1979) propose a theory according to which new English denominal verbs are created almost without constraints.

Their reasoning goes roughly like this: in some situations the speaker/writer can presuppose that the listener/reader is able to interpret the meaning of the denominal verb "in such a way that the parent noun denotes one role in the situation, and the remaining surface arguments of the denominal verb denote other roles in the situation" (787). Their examples include anything from well-established lexicalized items like paint (the ceiling) /LOCATUM (= "verbs ... whose parent nouns are in the objective case in clauses that describe the location of one thing with respect to another" (769))/ and harpoon (the whale) /INSTRUMENT/ to more absurd creations like extract-of-beef (the bread) /Punch; LOCATUM/ and he enfant-terrible'd gracefully /AGENT/. Their corpus of some 1,300 items is undoubtedly of some interest to a lexicographer faced with the delicate task of deciding which items to include in his dictionary. However, many of them are unlikely to gain ground because they are simply none-words, or rather nonce forms, while others are marked as innovations although they are well known verbs in English (e.g. shortlist, blanket (a bed) = 'cover as if with a blanket', robe (the child).

Clark & Clark's theory, then, increases the role of pragmatics in lexical processes and at the same time raises the question of the division of labour between (lexical) semantics and pragmatics. Beard argues that "Clark & Clark /and Aronoff (1980)/ seem to expect too much of pragmatics and L-rules /= lexical rules/ which are too vague" (1981:263). Obviously conversion makes use of the inherent economy of the English lexicon, but as described by Clark & Clark, it is very often a stylistic device with a direct appeal to particular groups or readers (such as readers of Punch) in non-informative informal contexts. It is worth remembering a distinction which Potter makes: that between "permanent /functional/ shifts that reflect changes in social habit and way of life, and temporary shifts that are made by speakers and writers in quest of stylistic novelty" (1969:169). Most of the examples in Clark & Clark seem to represent the second category.

It is generally assumed that lexical processes are unidirectional, i.e. you start from the base (or lexical prime) rather than from the derivatives. In turn, a derivative then makes up the base for a more complex form, as in the case of pedestrian above. Leech (1981:220-225) suggests five properties of lexical rules which account for the internal creativity of the lexicon ('diversity', 'semantic open-endedness', 'recursiveness', 'bidirectionality', 'petrification'). Thus, according to Leech, conversion is characterized by 'bidirectionality', i.e. the rule $[X_N] \rightarrow [X_V]$ should be written $[X_N] \leftrightarrow [X_V]$. Arguments for such a synchronic approach to conversion can be found in English (but not in Swedish or Finnish). Barnhart et al., for instance, point out that "sometimes functional shifts are difficult to determine because new words appear almost simultaneously in several parts of speech" (1980:210). An example is upmarket (Adj/Adv). Nevertheless, in many instances the direction of conversion is easily recognizable (e.g. lecture (N) - lecture (V)).

An early observation made by Jespersen was that "One and the same /denominal/ verb may very often mean two or more different things, the context only showing what is meant in each particular case" (1942:93). However, the semantic relationship varies considerably in complexity. For example, bottle (N) and bottle (V) the wine has a more concrete relationship than Shylock (N) and Shylock (V) £2,700 from the £17,000 raised. While Clark & Clark ascribe their denominal verbs to performance, Beard is inclined to explain the relationship between noun and verb as linguistic. More specifically, he ascribes the relationship between lexical and syntactic derivation to "a lexical-syntactic prelexical deep structure ... characterized by grammatically determined case functions (relations) shared by all IE languages" (322). Beard's approach looks attractive from the point of view of linguistic theory. Only such information as is not explicable in terms of lexical rules based on deep structure relations is catered for by performance (and pragmatics).

As far as the role of conversion is concerned, it should still be pointed out that a very large proportion of denominal verbs are used both transitively and intransitively; some (e.g. move, change, open) also occur in ergative constructions. This adds considerably to the syntactic and semantic potential of the base vocabulary.

Whether one looks at conversion as 'zero-formation' or as 'conversion' in the proper sense of the word, whether one adopts a diachronic or synchronic point of view (cp. Adams 1973:37-56), it is obvious that the semantic relationship between the parent noun and the verb is not arbitrary. Clark & Clark should be given credit for focusing more attention on this phenomenon. They also demonstrate

various stages that these verbs undergo in their development from complete innovations (e.g. houseguest) to opaque idioms (e.g. boycott). It remains to be seen if Jespersen's contextual interpretation of compounds can be fitted into a similar pragmatic perspective (1942:137).

3.2 COMPOUNDING

While there are different views of conversion as a lexical process, compounding, too, offers scope for different approaches. Kastovsky (1982) stresses the complex interaction of syntax, semantics and lexicon in word-formation processes. In this he follows Marchand (1969), but Kastovsky devotes more attention to a formalized description of these phenomena. He prefers a transformationalist approach within a semantically oriented grammar (case grammar) to a lexicalist approach on a syntactic basis (1982:246).

In this connection I shall only make a few comments on compounding as a productive process within the high-frequency English vocabulary. Compounding is a way of condensing the content and simplifying the structure of sentences. The information content is high in a compound: a beer bottle is a hyponym of bottle in the same way as beer is a hyponym of beverage or drink. A blackbird carries more information than a black bird; the former contrasts with all the other species of birds, the latter with the other colours or whatever properties birds can have. The steadily growing number of compounds in English is a linguistic manifestation of the growing amount of information in society.

What, then, are the implications of the transformationalist vs. lexicalist hypotheses for the study of the potential extension of the base vocabulary?[4] In the light of the two examples just mentioned, beer bottle and blackbird would both be derived syntactically according to the transformationalist hypothesis, but only blackbird is lexicalized. The semantic problem that arises with blackbird has to do with the fact that the bill of the blackbird is yellow, and, above all, that the female is brown.

The majority of the compounds which can be formed by syntactic rules out of very common primes are semantically transparent, i.e. their meaning can be predicted on the basis of the meaning of each member, as in

armchair 'a chair which (S) has (V) /support for the/ arms (O)' (cp. easy-chair)
baby-boy 'a boy who (S) is (V) a baby (C)'
beer bottle 'a bottle which (S) is (V) for beer (A)'
bookshop 'a shop which (S) sells (V) books (O)' (cp. workshop)
carsick 'sick of travelling in a car (A)' (cp. homesick)

Bottle can equally well be preceded by Coca-Cola, brandy, sauce, wine, whisky, or a word for any other liquid that can be bottled. What upsets the picture is the degrees of transparency that exist (cp. items within parentheses), semantic

change, and particularly the limited productivity of syntactic derivation in any given instance.

A useful exercise is to give students a set of words like

iceman 'a man who carries ice' or 'a man who is skilled in climbing over ice'

snowman 'a figure which looks like a man and which is made of snow'

policeman 'a man who belongs to the police'

chairman 'a person who sits in a (special) chair at a meeting'

and make them sort out the semantic problems that arise with a syntactic derivation when the same head is preceded by different types of modifier. The problem is the variety of verbs that are needed to relate the two members of the compound to each other. Why is not iceman equivalent to 'a figure which looks like a man and which is made of ice' or 'a man who sells ice(cream)', analogous to milkman? The only solution to this problem is to refer to knowledge of the world. Some obvious semantic relationships between the members of the compound can undoubtedly be singled out (cp. Levi 1978), but for the semantic interpretation one may have to resort to the context, as in the case of conversion.

The lexicalist solution proposed by Jackendoff (1975:655-656) is to make use of redundancy rules. But his treatment of the semantic element is superficial, which can be seen from the fact that he groups items like garbage man, iceman, milkman, breadbasket and oil drum under the same rule although the semantic relationship between the two parts of the compound is not identical for any of these. Thus breadbasket and oil drum refer to /Z THAT IS FOR W/ (Z = basket, drum; W = bread, oil) rather than /Z THAT CARRIES W/ and behave like beer bottle. I can see no semantic relationship between iceman and beer bottle.

A relevant question in connection with the most frequent words in a language is to what extent they are made up of compounds and derivations. The lexical compounds shared by all my 5 word lists include afternoon (L 122 = has the absolute frequency of 122 in the LOB Corpus; on LOB see (4)), football (L 37), newspaper (L 65), policeman (L 15), and railway (L 66). Moreover, there are some more or less opaque items such as breakfast (L 50), grandfather (L 20), holiday (L 107), and island (L 76). The most frequent compounds in LOB are commonwealth (156), husband (133), afternoon (102), chairman (100), and household (68). These numbers include the inflected forms.

Cross-listing of the primes in the base vocabulary gives a large number of compounds which can be added to the original list. A preliminary calculation shows that the intersection of the 5 word lists (= 659 items) will be increased by about 25-30 % if the potential transparent compounds are added. An even higher figure is obtained if opaque formations are included as well. The generative capacity of derivations will probably be lower.[5]

4 DATA AND CORPORA

This brings me to the last section of my paper, which will deal with data. Dictionaries, corpora, word lists and texts of various kinds make up the main sources of lexical research. To this must be added psycholinguistic data from research on language acquisition and language learning. The discussion here will treat corpora only.

Because of the storage function of the lexicon, data are crucial in lexicology. The idiosyncratic nature of lexical items is conspicuous both with regard to the types of words that you find in a large corpus (like the Brown Corpus or the LOB Corpus)[6] and the uneven distribution of words. This observation is matched by the fact that there is also a great deal of individual lexical variation both qualitatively and quantitatively (cp. Hudson 1981:341-342).

The usefulness of Brown and LOB for lexical research has been documented elsewhere (cp. various articles in ICAME NEWS; Johansson 1980). However, the recent Word Frequencies in British and American English by Hofland & Johansson deserves a note. The book is first of all a statistical presentation of the unlemmatized word forms in the LOB Corpus, but it also contains an alphabetical list which gives the frequencies of the word forms in the Brown and the LOB Corpora with difference coefficients. The book will therefore be specially valuable as a starting-point for the comparison of British and American English vocabulary, and for stylistic analysis (press reportage, scientific and literary registers). Each corpus is made up of 1,000,000 items, which the compilers admit is a relatively small number. By comparison, a corpus of some 10,000,000 words has been considered acceptable for work on a new learners' dictionary of English under John Sinclair and Patrick Hanks (personal communication). For the study of collocations corpora of 20-25 million words have been proposed.

To what extent, then, does LOB cover the most frequent words in English? As far as the base vocabulary is concerned, it turns out that all the items shared by the 5 lists mentioned previously occur in LOB (allowing for the fact that CAMLIST, because of its size, is represented only at frequency levels 1-3; cp. Hindmarsh, 1980:xiii). On the other hand, LOB does not contain all the 3,457 different items in COMPLIST. Some items which do not occur at all or only as part of a compound are:

banana (banana-packing 1 = compound occurs once in LOB)
bike (motor-bike 3; bicycle 14)
cafeteria (B 17 = occurs 17 times in Brown)
camping (B 19)
commute (commuter 1; B 14)
gymnastics (B 11)

gym (B 2)
housework (B 2)
moped
photo (colour-photo 1, publicity photo 1; photograph 51)
rucksack
tobacconist (tobacconist-libraries charge 1)
tourism
vanilla

It may very well be that these items reveal more about the TEFL lists than about LOB. Colloquial forms like bike, gym and photo are typical of spoken English although there seems to be a preference for the short form in compounds in LOB (motor-bike, colour-photo). That tourism should be missing is surprising. Judging from the OED, commute should have been established even in British English by the early 60s. The difference in frequency revealed by Brown and LOB might suggest that there was still a difference between American and British English in the use of this item at the time.

From commute it is a very short step to compute, and hence to computers. Concordances have of course been available for a long time for lexical research, but we have not had such general corpora as Brown and LOB for very long. For detailed lexical study of moderately sized materials (up to about 25,000 items perhaps), for which no concordances exist, it may be worthwhile to make one's own concordance. For this purpose and for the comparison of lexical files the computer is extremely useful. This applies to the study of any stage of the English language. It can, for instance, apply to the study of diachrony in the present, such as the development of the English lexicon since 1961 if anybody should like to produce a new British or American lexical data bank for lexical research or look at specific text samples written a generation later for comparison.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In English studies lexicology has so far had a place in the history of vocabulary, dialect research, derivational morphology, word-formation, and in its application to lexicography and stylistics. In the way lexicology has been defined and described here, it is a wide field of research. It comprises both irregularities or idiosyncracies, such as the semantic properties of lexical items, and regularities, for instance the fact that the suffix -less to make adjectives is only added to nouns (homeless, childless). It would be presumptious to maintain that lexicology is an autonomous subdivision of linguistics. Still it is legitimate to study it because it focuses on lexical items rather than

sentences, which is the domain of grammar proper. It is another matter that sentences are made up of words or lexemes and that grammar may be needed to account for how lexical items are created.

NOTES

1. Although Ginsburg et al. 1966 is weak theoretically, parts of it would still do as a textbook.

2. The abbreviations are given in the references below. For some data on these lists and a description of LONGLIST, particularly, see Wikberg 1983.

3. On conversion, see Esko Pennanen's paper in this volume.

4. The transformationalist/lexicalist controversy goes back to Chomsky 1970.

5. In a forthcoming cand.philol. thesis by Gerd Nordang Pedersen, Tromsø, it is further shown that the vocabulary taught to schoolchildren has an internal productiveness beyond the actual items taught in class.

6. The items in the Brown Corpus are listed in Kučera & Francis 1967. The LOB Corpus = The Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus. Its word forms are listed in Hofland & Johansson 1982.

REFERENCES

Adams, Valerie. 1973. An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation. Longman.

Aronoff, Mark. 1980. "Contextuals". Language 56. 744-758.

Barnhart, Clarence L., Steinmetz, S. & Barnhart, Robert K.. 1980. The Second Barnhart Dictionary of New English. New York: Barnhart Books.

Beard, Robert. 1981. The Indo-European Lexicon. A Full Synchronic Theory. Amsterdam/New York/Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Co..

Bresnan, Joan. 1978. "A realistic transformational grammar". In Morris Halle et al. Linguistic Theory and Psychological Reality, Cambridge, Mass. & London: M.I.T. Press, 1-59.

Chomsky, Noam. 1970. "Remarks on nominalization". In Roderick A. Jacobs & Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.), Readings in English Transformational Grammar, Waltham, Mass.: Ginn, 184-221.

Clark, Eve & Clark, Herbert. 1979. "When nouns surface as verbs". Language 55. 767-811.

Crystal, David. 1980. A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. London: Andre Deutsch.

van Ek, Jan A. 1977. The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools. London: Longman. (T-LIST)

Engelska. Förslag till basmål och basstoff i grundskolan. Helsinki: Skolstyrelsen 1978. (FINNLIST)

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. "The case for case". In Emmon Bach & Robert T. Harms (eds.), Universals in Linguistic Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1-88.

Ginsburg, R. S., Khidel, S. S., Knyazeva, G. Y. & Sankin, A. A. 1966. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. Moscow: Higher Publishing House.

Halliday, Michael. 1978. Language as Social Semiotic. The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. London: Edwin Arnold.

Hindmarsh, Roland. 1980. Cambridge English Lexicon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (CAMLIST)

Hoekstra, Teun, van der Hulst, Harry & Moortgat, Michael (eds.). 1981. Lexical Grammar (Publications in Language Sciences, 3). Dordrecht & Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.

Hofland, Knut & Johansson, Stig. 1982. Word Frequencies in British and American English. Bergen: The Norwegian Computing Centre for the Humanities.

Hudson, Richard. 1981. "Some issues on which linguists can agree". JL 17. 333-343.

Jackendoff, Ray S. 1975. "Morphological and semantic regularities in the lexicon". Language 51. 639-671.

Jespersen, Otto. 1942. A Modern English Grammar, VI, Morphology. London & Copenhagen.

Johansson, Stig. 1980. "Word frequencies in British and American English: Some preliminary observations". In Jens Allwood & Magnus Ljung (eds.), ALVAR. A Linguistically Varied Assortment of Readings. Studies Presented to Alvar Ellegård on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday. (Stockholm Papers in English Language and Literature, 1). Department of English, University of Stockholm, 56-74.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1982. Wortbildung und Semantik (Studienreihe Englisch, 14). Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann-Bagel & Bern/München: Francke Verlag.

Kučera, Henry & Francis, W. Nelson. 1967. Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press.

Labov, William. 1973a. "The boundaries of words and their meanings". In C. J. Bailey & R. Shuy (eds.), New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 340-373.

Labov, William. 1973b. "Lexicography and generative grammar I: Hedges and meaning criteria". In Raven I. McDavid, Jr. & Audrey R. Duckert (eds.), Lexicography in English (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 211), New York, 144-153.

Leech, Geoffrey. 1981. Semantics. The Study of Meaning. 2nd ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Levi, J. N. 1978. The Syntax and Semantics of Complex Nominals. New York, etc.: Academic Press.

Ljung, Magnus. 1970. English Denominal Adjectives. A Generative Study of the Semantics of a Group of High-Frequency Denominal Adjectives in English. (Gothenburg Studies in English, 21). Lund: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Marchand, Hans. 1969. The Categories and Types of English Word-Formation. 2nd ed. München: C. H. Beck.

Mønsterplan for grunnskolen, Oslo 1974. (NORLIST)

Potter, Simeon. 1969. Changing English. London: Andre Deutsch.

Procter, Paul (ed.). 1978. The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Bath: Longman. (LDOCE, LONGLIST)

Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 1972. A Grammar of Contemporary English. London: Longman.

Rosch, Eleanor. 1973. "Natural categories". CogPsy 4, 328-350.

Scheler, Manfred. 1977. Der englische Wortschatz (Grundlagen der Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 9). Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1982. The Syntax of Words. Cambridge, Mass. & London: M.I.T. Press.

Warren, Beatrice. 1978. Semantic Patterns of Noun-Noun Compounds. (Gothenburg Studies in English, 41). Lund: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Wasow, T. 1977. "Transformations and the lexicon". In P. Cullicover, T. Wasow & A. Akmajian (eds.), Formal Syntax. New York: Academic Press.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1963. "Lexicology". In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 1, Soviet and East European Linguistics. Mouton, 60-93.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1980. On Semantics (ed. by William Labov & Beatrice S. Weinreich), University of Pennsylvania Press.

West, Michael. 1953. A General Service List of English Words. Rev. ed. London: Longman.

Wikberg, Kay. 1983. "Some characteristics of a defining vocabulary". In Henrik Holmboe (ed.), Nordisk Forskerkursus om datamatunderstøttet leksikografi (Aug. 1982). Aarhus: Institute of Linguistics, University of Aarhus, 77-84.